DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 309 HE 021 176

TITLE	Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87. A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	CPEC-87-36
PUB DATE	Sep 87
NOTE	51p.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Rank (Professional); Administrators; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Compensation (Remuneration); Higher Education; Medical School Faculty; Peer Institutions; Public Colleges; State Legislation; *State Universities; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	California Community Colleges; *California State University; *University of California

ABSTRACT

Salaries of faculty at the University of California, the California State University, and the California community colleges are reported and compared to those of peer institutions. Salaries of 18 campus-based administrators and between 10 and 12 central office administrators at the universities are also covered, along with comparison institution data for the campus-based positions. In addition, data on compensation received by faculty physicians at the University of California and its comparison institutions are presented. Average faculty salary data for 1986-1987 for the universities and comparison institutions are provided by academic rank, including 5-year percentage rate of change. Data are also provided for the California community colleges with the highest mean salaries among reported districts, as well as for the 10 lowest paying districts for 1977, 1979, 1981, 1983, 1985, and 1986. Cost of living adjustments granted to regular and contract community college faculty are also reported by district for 1984 to 1986. Appended is information on compensation plans for medical school clinical faculty. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE 021 176

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Summary

This report consists of four independent sections.

Part One involves faculty salaries at the University of California and the California Stated University. The Commission's faculty salary methodology requires that both institutions update the information presented in the Commission's January annual report on faculty salaries when any comparison institution does not submit complete data for the current academic year. This year, one of the University's and eight of the State University's comparison institutions fell into that category, and Part One presents complete data for the University's group of eight comparison institutions and the State University's group of 20, resulting in no change in the University's 2.1 percent parity figure but an increase in the State University's figure from 6.9 to 7.2 percent.

The remaining three parts of the report respond to Supplemental Language to the 1978, 1979, and 1981 Budget Acts, which direct the Commission to prepare annual reports on the salaries of California Community Colleges' faculty and of University and State University administrators as well as biennial reports in odd-numbered years on University medical faculty salaries.

Part Two thus presents an overview of faculty salaries in the Community Colleges, and it estimates the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at $39,159.

Part Three shows the salaries of 18 campus-based and between 10 and 12 central office administrators at the University and the State University, with comparison institution data for the campus-based positions.

Finally, Part Four presents data from the University and its comparison institutions on the compensation received by faculty physicians.

The Commission adopted this report on September 21, 1987, on recommendation of its Policy Development Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Publications Office of the Commission. Further information about the report may be obtained from William L. Storey of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8018.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1986-87

A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 87-36
PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1987

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 87-36 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

1. Update of University of California and California State University Faculty Salaries 1

   Introduction 1

   University of California 1

   California State University 1

2. Faculty Salaries in the California Community Colleges 5

   Introduction 5

   Average Salaries 5

   Part-Time Faculty and Full-Time Faculty with Overload Assignments 7

   Summary 13

3. Selected Administrators' Salaries at the University of California and the California State University 17

   University of California 17

   The California State University 17

4. Medical Faculty Salaries at the University of California 21

Appendix A: Letter from Kenneth B. O'Brien to Gerald Hayward, August 9, 1979 25

Appendix B: University of California Report on Medical School Clinical Compensation Plans and Clinical Faculty Salaries 27

Displays

1. University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1981-82 and 1986-87, Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1987-88, Projected Parity Comparisons, and Projected 1987-88 Staffing Patterns 2

2. California State University Faculty Salary Parity Calculations, 1987-88 (Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1981-82 and 1986-87; Five-Year Compound Rates of Increase; Comparison Institution 1987-88 Projected Salaries; California State University 1986-87 Average Salaries; 1987-88 Projected Percentage Salary Deficiency; 1986-87 Staffing Patterns) 3

3. Mean Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1986-87 6

4. The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1977 to Fall 1986 8

5. The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1977 to Fall 1986 9

6. Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1977 to Fall 1986 10

7. Cost of Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1984-85 to 1986-87 11-12

8. Sonoma County Junior College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1986-87 13

9. Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1980 to Fall 1986 14

10. Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1986-87 18

11. Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1986-87 19

12. Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, 1986-87 20

13. University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1986-87 (General Medicine) 22

14. University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1986-87 (Surgery) 22

15. University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1986-87 (Pediatrics) 23

16. Ranking of University of California Medical Faculty Compensation in Relation to the Amounts Paid at its Comparison Institutions, Selected Years from 1979-80 to 1986-87 23

1 *Update of University of California and California State University Faculty Salaries*

Introduction

The 1987-88 Budget cycle was the second in which the Commission conducted its analysis of academic salaries under its updated methodology (CPEC, 1985) and the first in several years that involved a comprehensive examination of the raw data supplied by the comparison institutions of the University of California and the California State University. Although several of these comparison universities submitted incomplete data, a formula developed by the Commission's Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology provided for their inclusion in the derivation of the overall parity percentages for each segment. That formula produced figures indicating that University of California faculty salaries would have to be increased by 2.1 percent in 1987-88 to equal the mean salary paid by that segment's eight comparison institutions. The comparable figure for the California State University was 6.9 percent. Both of those figures were transmitted to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst on December 5, 1986, and they appeared in the Commission's March 1987 report, *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1987-88.*

The December figures were based on complete data from seven of the University's eight comparison institutions, and 12 of the State University's group of 20. Since that time, all nine institutions that submitted incomplete information have updated their payroll data and supplied them in the required format to the segmental central offices, which then forwarded them to Commission staff.

University of California

One of the University's eight comparison institutions could not submit complete data due to lengthy collective bargaining negotiations. These negotiations have been completed, and indicate that the increase at the university in question was somewhat lower than anticipated in December.

In addition, another institution informed the University that it had made an error in its original submission, and that its overall mean salary should have been slightly higher. These two changes effectively neutralized each other, with the result that the University's parity figure remains at 2.1 percent. The revised calculations used to produce this figure are shown in Display 1 on page 2.

California State University

Because of collective bargaining negotiations, the late scheduling of computerized payroll runs, and the selection of a large number of new comparison institutions where close working relations had not yet been established, eight of the State University's 20 comparison institutions did not submit complete payroll data as of the December 1986 deadline. All of those institutions have now submitted complete data, with five reporting higher salaries and three reporting lower. The net effect is to increase the parity figure by 0.24 percentage points.

In addition, another .07 of a percentage point should be added to account for an alteration in one institution's average produced by the application of an incorrect conversion of 11-month faculty to 9-month faculty. Accordingly, the 6.90 percent figure reported to the Commission in January should be increased to 7.21 percent. The updated figures are shown in Display 2 on page 3.

DISPLAY 1 University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1981-82 and 1986-87, Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1987-88, Projected Parity Comparisons, and Projected 1987-88 Staffing Patterns

Academic Rank	Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1981-82	Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1986-87	Compound Rate of Increase	Comparison Group Projected Salaries, 1987-88
Professor	$41,714	$58,862	7.1297%	$63,058
Associate Professor	28,126	40,278	7.4465	43,277
Assistant Professor	22,941	33,312	7.7447	35,892

Academic Rank	University of California Average Salaries 1986-87	Comparison Group Average Salaries		Percentage Increase Required in UC Average Salaries	
		1986-87 (Actual)	1987-88 (Projected)	1986-87 (Actual)	1987-88 (Projected)
Professor	$61,983	$58,862	$63,058	-5.04%	1.73%
Associate Professor	41,010	40,278	43,277	-1.79	5.53
Assistant Professor	36,126	33,312	35,892	-7.79	-0.65
All Ranks Average (UC Staffing Pattern)	$54,164	$51,556	$55,287	-4.81%	2.07%
All Ranks Average (Comparison Institution Staffing Pattern)	$51,679	$49,140	$52,717	-4.91%	2.01%
All Ranks Average (Combined Staffing Pattern)	$52,922	$50,348	$54,002	-4.86%	2.04%

Institutional Budget Year Staffing Pattern (Full Time Equivalent)	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total
University of California	3,346	996	724	5,066
Comparison Institutions	4,864.71	1,865.32	1,943.26	8,673.29

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

DISPLAY 2 *California State University Faculty Salary Parity Calculations, 1987-88 (Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1981-82 and 1986-87; Five-Year Compound Rates of Increase; Comparison Institution 1987-88 Projected Salaries; California State University 1986-87 Average Salaries; 1987-88 Projected Percentage Salary Deficiency; 1986-87 Staffing Patterns)*

Academic Rank	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1981-82	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1986-87	Five-Year Percentage Rate of Change	Comparison Group Projected Salaries 1987-88
Professor	$37,365	$50,719	6.3024%	$53,916
Associate Professor	27,835	37,709	6.2601	40,069
Assistant Professor	22,267	31,205	6.9830	33,384
Instructor	17,453	23,661	6.2763	25,147

Item	California State University Average Salaries 1986-87	Comparison Group Average Salaries		Percentage Increase Required in CSU Average Salaries	
		1986-87 (Actual)	1987-88 (Projected)	1986-87 (Actual)	1987-88 (Projected)
Professor	$49,077	$50,719	$53,916	3.35%	9.86%
Associate Professor	37,900	37,709	40,029	-0.50	5.62
Assistant Professor	30,658	31,205	33,384	1.79	8.89
Instructor	26,370	23,661	25,147	-10.27	-4.64
All Ranks Averages: Weighted by CSU Staffing:	$43,984	$45,015	$47,865	2.34%	8.82%
Weighted by Comparison Inst. Staffing:	$39,593	$40,137	$42,699	1.38%	7.85%
Mean All Ranks Average and Gross Parity Percentage	$41,788	$42,576	$45,282	1.89%	8.36%
Adjustments:					
Turnover and Prom.:			-83		0.20%
Effect of Law Faculty:			-83		0.20%
Merit Award Adjust.:			-313		0.75%
Net Parity Salary and Pct.			$44,802		7.21%

Institutional Current Year Staffing Pattern (Headcount)	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total
California State University	7,450	2,627	1,417	175	11,669
Comparison Institutions	4,162	4,297	2,960	435	11,854

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

2 *Faculty Salaries in the California Community Colleges*

Introduction

In February 1979, the Legislative Analyst recommended in his *Analysis of the Budget Bill, 1979-80* that the Commission include information on California Community College faculty salaries in its annual faculty salary reports. Responding to this recommendation, the Commission published a report on the subject in April 1979, presenting data for the 1977-78 fiscal year but not for 1978-79 (the then current year), since the Chancellor's Office (recently renamed the Chancellery) had abandoned such data collection as part of the cutbacks resulting from the passage of Proposition 13 in June of 1978.

Subsequently, Commission staff proposed that the submission of Community College faculty salary data be formalized, and for that purpose the Legislature appropriated $15,000 to the Chancellery for the 1979-80 fiscal year. In August 1979, Commission staff outlined for the Chancellor the specific information desired (Appendix A), and asked the Chancellor's staff to submit 1978-79 data by November 1, 1979 and data for subsequent fiscal years by March 1 of the year involved.

For the next four years, the Chancellery experienced a number of problems in its efforts to provide the Legislature and the Commission with data. For 1979-80 and 1980-81, the reports were compiled without the benefit of a modern computerized data system, with the result that several reports contained numerous errors. In 1981-82, however, the Chancellery initiated the "Staff Data File," a computerized data collection system that is now in its sixth year of operation and which has provided comprehensive reports for the past four years. The system's first year was marked by the normal difficulties inherent in the establishment of any new computer system, and the second was further handicapped by a fire that destroyed many of the computer programs and equipment necessary to produce the annual report. The past four years, however, have produced more comprehensive and accurate reports that contain information on average salaries and salary ranges; cost-of-living adjustments; teaching loads; numbers of full and part-time faculty; age, sex, and ethnicity; numbers of new hires, promotions, and leaves; and qualifications for various salary categories.

Although substantially improved from prior years, however, two problems remain. The first relates to the submission of data that are incomplete due primarily to extended collective bargaining negotiations, a problem that has also been encountered with several of the comparison institutions used by the University of California and the California State University. When negotiations extend into the current academic year, and cost-of-living adjustments are accordingly allocated retroactively, there is seldom sufficient time to include the increases in the mean salary figures reported. The result is that many of the mean salaries reported are inaccurate. In addition, cost-of-living adjustments were not reported at all for 16 of the system's 70 districts.

The second problem is that complete salary adjustments are not always reported. In 1985-86, for example, one-time "off-schedule" adjustments were granted to faculty in 13 districts. In addition, the Chancellery chose to average all increases granted after July 1 over the entire year. Thus, a 5 percent increase granted on January 1 is only counted as a 2.5 percent increase, even though the effect is to lift the entire salary schedule by 5 percent by the end of the fiscal year. These problems are discussed further in the next section.

Average salaries

Display 3 on page 6 shows 1986-87 mean salaries as reported by 69 of the 70 districts, the San Bernardino Community College District not reporting. The first footnote in that display indicates the 16 districts that did not report cost-of-living increases for 1986-87, and therefore could not incorporate such increases into their mean salary figures. Consequently

DISPLAY 3 Mean Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1986-87

District	Mean Salary	District	Mean Salary
Allan Hancock[1]	$33,962	Pasadena Area	$38,640
Antelope Valley[2]	35,733	Peralta	36,123
Barstow[1]	35,055	Rancho Santiago	39,823
Butte[1]	36,996	Redwoods[1]	37,739
Cabrillo[2]	32,960	Rio Hondo[1]	40,481
Cerritos[1]	41,746	Riverside[2]	37,049
Chaffey[1]	35,837	Saddleback[2]	41,815
Citrus[2]	40,450	San Bernardino	N/A
Coachella Valley	35,718	San Diego[1]	32,173
Coast[1]	39,532	San Diego Adult[2]	25,332
Compton[2]	30,929	San Francisco Centers[1]	32,700
Contra Costa	43,998	San Francisco[1]	37,514
El Camino	40,242	San Joaquin Delta	44,029
Foothill	41,711	San Jose	38,937
Fremont-Newark[1]	37,207	San Luis Obispo	38,258
Gavilan[1]	35,893	San Mateo[1]	39,333
Glendale	38,418	Santa Barbara[2]	34,794
Grossmont[1]	35,436	Santa Clarita	37,806
Hartnell	38,598	Santa Monica	41,334
Imperial[2]	32,090	Sequoias[1]	38,671
Kern[1]	34,898	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	38,109
Lake Tahoe	35,223	Sierra[1]	36,920
Lassen[2]	32,856	Siskiyou	36,106
Long Beach	42,326	Solano County	38,813
Los Angeles[2]	38,584	Sonoma County	39,488
Los Rios[2]	35,474	South County[1]	37,281
Marin[1]	38,420	Southwestern[1]	36,988
Mendocino	34,979	State Center	37,997
Merced[1]	36,793	Ventura County[1]	37,227
Mira Costa	39,379	Victor Valley[2]	34,061
Monterey Peninsula[2]	34,385	West Hills	36,533
Mount San Antonio	40,632	West Kern	41,934
Mount San Jacinto	35,449	West Valley	39,231
Napa	33,099	Yosemite[1]	37,207
North Orange	39,933	Yuba[2]	37,040
Palo Verde	35,285		
Palomar[2]	37,552	Total	$38,005

1. District was still in the process of salary negotiations for 1986-87 at the time mean salary data were reported. Consequently, the salaries reported more closely approximate the 1985-86 mean.

2. Although salary negotiations were complete as of the Chancellery's deadline for reporting data, mean salary data do not reflect the 1986-87 cost-of-living adjustment. Consequently, the salaries reported more closely approximate the 1985-86 mean.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellery.

the salaries reported more nearly approximate 1985-86 salaries. The second footnote includes districts where salary negotiations were complete, but which did not have sufficient time to incorporate those increases into their mean salary figures. In all, Display 3 indicates that accurate current-year data are available for only 31 districts, 44.3 percent of the 70 possible. In addition, the faculty employed by those districts represent only 38.1 percent of the systemwide total. Accordingly, it is probable that the actual mean salary for the system is several percentage points higher than the $38,005 reported. To provide an estimate of actual salaries, the mean salaries of the 38 nonreporting districts (excluding San Bernardino which reported no data) were incremented by 5 percent, a procedure that resulted in a systemwide mean salary of $39,159. There is no way of knowing how accurate that figure may be, but the probability is that it is closer to reality than the $38,005 contained in the Chancellery's report.

Displays 4 and 5 on pages 8 and 9 show mean salaries as reported in the Staff Data File for regular and contract faculty in the ten highest and ten lowest paying districts for each odd-numbered year between Fall 1975 and Fall 1985, and the systemwide means for each of those years. In each case, those districts reporting incomplete mean salary data are indicated. Display 6 on page 10 shows mean salaries for those districts as a group, the percentage difference between them, and the total number of faculty.

Display 7 on pages 11-12 provides cost-of-living adjustment data, by district, for the current and previous two years, weighted by the size of faculty in each district. In each case, off-schedule payments and mid-year adjustments are reflected, inclusions that increase the systemwide average from the 4.44 percent reported by the Chancellery for 1985-86 to 5.04 percent, and the 3.52 percent reported for 1986-87 to 5.52 percent.

From Display 6 it can be seen that those districts with higher salaries tend to be the larger districts, and also tend to be those reporting complete data. The first of these points is actually more pronounced than shown in Display 6, at least for 1979 through 1986, since the evening program at San Diego was included in the overall districtwide averages. Faculty working in that program tend to be paid about 20 percent less than regular faculty at the main campus, and their inclusion consequently reduces the districtwide average. Were they to be excluded, the difference between the highest and lowest paying districts would be even greater, thus highlighting the size factor even more. Either way, the difference in mean salaries between the highest paying districts and the lowest paying districts is almost 30 percent, and the margin has increased slightly each year since 1977. The probability, however – with nine of the ten lowest paying but only three of the ten highest paying districts reporting incomplete data – is that the true difference between the two groups is closer to 25 percent. In 1986-87, the highest paying district was San Joaquin Delta with a mean of $44,029. The lowest was Compton at $30,929, a difference of 42.4 percent – though it should be noted that Compton's faculty had not agreed to a contract as of the time the Chancellery compiled its report. Among those districts that had completed negotiations, the lowest paying was the Napa District at $33,099 – a difference of 33.0 percent.

The Chancellery also provided salary schedules for each of the 70 districts in the Community College System. These generally provide a number of salary categories or classes through which a faculty member can advance depending on his or her educational qualifications, and another series of steps that provide salary increases based on longevity. A typical schedule is shown in Display 8 on page 13. As with mean salaries, these schedules vary greatly from district to district, some offering only one salary classification based on educational achievement, while others offer as many as nine. In addition, some districts offer as few as 12 anniversary increments, while others offer 30 or more. In some cases, additional stipends are offered for doctoral degree holders, department chairmen, and others with special qualifications or responsibilities.

Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments

For many years, the Community Colleges have employed a large number of part-time or temporary faculty, and most districts have also permitted regular and contract faculty to work additional hours or overloads. Display 9 on page 14 shows several comparisons between full-time, part-time, and overload faculty between 1980 and 1986. For example, it shows the number of full-time faculty with and without overload assignments compared to the number of part-time faculty. It also shows workload in

DISPLAY 4 The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1977 to Fall 1986

	Ten Highest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
District	1977 68	1979 70	1981 69	1983 70	1985 70	1986 69
San Joaquin Delta	$24,657	$27,715	$36,275	$35,579	$41,562	$44,029
Contra Costa	24,178	28,239	32,813		39,047	43,998
Long Beach	23,174	27,850	33,404	34,754	39,547	42,326
West Kern				36,786	38,975	41,934
Saddleback[1]	23,748	27,732	35,071	37,697	42,083	41,815
Cerritos[1]	23,697		33,153	34,900	39,258	41,746
Foothill/De Anza		27,919	33,234		41,547	41,711
Santa Monica			32,033		39,809	41,334
Mt. San Antonio				34,942	38,417	40,632
Rio Hondo[1]						40,481
Peralta	23,354	27,754				
San Mateo	24,420					
Monterey Peninsula						
Mira Costa						
San Jose		28,125		35,053		
Coast		27,801	33,245	35,015		
North Orange	23,763	27,755	32,070			
Chaffey	23,729					
Citrus	23,318					
Coachella Valley		27,640			39,211	
Sequoias			32,116	38,750		
El Camino				37,110		
Statewide Mean Salary[2]	**$22,413**	**$26,270**	**$30,156**	**$32,704**	**$36,203**	**$38,005**

1. 1986-87 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.
2. Weighted by total faculty in each district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellery.

terms of weekly faculty contact hours (WFCH) -- the actual number of hours faculty spend in classrooms. Comparing these two, it can be seen that, while part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty by just over a three-to-two margin, they teach about 35 percent of the WFCH. Regular and contract faculty teach about 58 percent, and those with overloads account for the remaining 6 or 7 percent. Regular and contract faculty on regular assignments average 15.0 WFCH in 1986-87, part-time faculty account for

DISPLAY 5 The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1977 to Fall 1986

	Ten Lowest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
District	1977 68	1979 70	1981 69	1983 70	1985 70	1986 69
Compton[1]		$23,924	$25,809	$29,091	$30,632	$30,929
San Diego[1,2]		22,707	26,573	27,829	31,174	30,983
Imperial[1]					30,900	32,090
Lassen[1]			27,416	29,098	32,308	32,856
Cabrillo[1]	$19,470			28,631	32,264	32,960
Napa		23,204		28,245	31,442	33,099
Allan Hancock[1]			27,469	28,401		33,962
Victor Valley[1]		23,743			31,967	34,061
Monterey Peninsula[1]						34,385
Santa Barbara[1]						34,794
Siskiyou				28,326		
Mt. San Jacinto	20,290					
Merced	19,918					
Fremont-Newark	19,812					
Gavilan	20,022	24,011	26,555		32,234	
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity						
Mendocino						
Palo Verde	15,528	21,539	25,369		30,930	
Ventura	20,231					
Solano	20,120					
Antelope Valley	19,905	22,028	26,440	29,185	32,341	
Lake Tahoe	19,047	23,692		28,429		
Rio Hondo		23,200				
West Kern		23,470				
San Francisco[3]			27,460			
Barstow			26,476			
Peralta			26,060	29,213		
Statewide Mean Salary[4]	**$22,413**	**$26,270**	**$30,156**	**$32,704**	**$36,203**	**$38,005**

1. 1986-87 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.
2. Regular and evening programs combined.
3. Regular and center programs combined.
4. Weighted by total faculty in each district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellery.

DISPLAY 6 Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1977 to Fall 1986

Item	Fall 1977	Fall 1979	Fall 1981	Fall 1983	Fall 1985	Fall 1986
Mean Salaries:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$23,838	$27,874	$33,213	$35,748	$40,059	$42,144
Unweighted	23,804	27,853	33,341	36,059	39,946	42,001
Ten Lowest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$19,888	$22,993	$26,675	$28,563	$31,547	$32,515
Unweighted	19,434	23,152	26,563	28,645	31,619	32,422
Percent Higher Paying Districts Exceed Lower Paying Districts (Weighted Means):	19.9%	21.2%	24.5%	25.2%	27.0%	29.6%
Systemwide Mean Salary (69 Districts)[1]	$22,413	$26,270	$30,156	$32,704	$36,203	$38,005
Number of Regular Faculty:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts	3,394	3,568	3,354	2,572	2,044	2,182
Ten Lowest Paying Districts	1,170	1,218	2,595	1,891	974	1,341
Percent Higher Paying Districts Exceed Lower Paying Districts (Total Faculty)	190.1%	192.9%	29.2%	36.0%	109.9%	62.7%

1. Weighted by total full-time faculty in each reporting district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellery.

5.4 hours in the classroom each week, and those teaching any overload average 4.7. About 36 percent of regular and contract faculty members teach some overload. All of these averages have been relatively constant for the seven-year period shown in Display 9.

Compensation comparisons between full-time and part-time faculty are difficult, since full-time faculty have responsibilities other than classroom teaching, while part-time faculty generally do not. Full-time faculty also spend time in counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service. Preparation for classroom teaching, however, necessarily occupies a considerable amount of time for both full-time and part-time faculty. The exact proportion of total workload devoted to activities not directly related to classroom teaching is not known, but an assumption used recently by the Chancellery is that 75 percent is instructionally related (teaching and preparation) with 25 percent devoted to other campus activities (Chancellor's Office, 1987, p. 7). With this factor, although not a precise measure, it is possible to present a general comparison.

The Chancellor's Office publishes hourly rates for part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments, and these systemwide data are also shown in item 5 in Display 9. This shows overload faculty are currently paid about 19 percent more than part-time faculty.

DISPLAY 7 Cost of Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1984-85 to 1986-87

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1984-85	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1985-86	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1986-87
Allan Hancock	91	6.50%	3.00%	6.00%
Antelope Valley	76	3.10	7.00	*
Barstow	25	5.00	2.00	5.50
Butte	98	6.69	6.04	5.82
Cabrillo	156	6.70	4.50	*
Cerritos	218	2.35	6.00	5.77
Chaffey	149	0.00	3.14	3.14
Citrus	109	6.00	6.00	*
Coachella Valley	100	5.00	0.00	5.00
Coast	536	5.50	6.00	0.00
Compton	64	5.00	*	*
Contra Costa	361	10.40	6.20	5.00
El Camino	287	1.50	5.25	6.00
Foothill	320	5.00	7.00	6.50
Fremont-Newark	92	9.00	4.99	6.00
Gavilan	51	5.50	10.00	6.50
Glendale	146	8.50	5.50	5.00
Grossmont	192	6.50	7.00	6.00
Hartnell	81	6.00	5.50	6.00
Imperial	75	3.00	3.00	*
Kern	245	4.00	3.00	2.00
Lake Tahoe	13	3.00	6.00	0.00
Lassen	44	4.58	0.00	*
Long Beach	237	0.00	12.60	6.50
Los Angeles	1664	6.00	0.00	*
Los Rios	563	7.10	7.91	*
Marin	133	7.50	0.00	15.10
Mendocino	32	4.00	5.50	5.70
Merced	85	4.00	4.79	4.00
MiraCosta	66	3.00	5.50	5.50
Monterey Peninsula	90	3.00	5.70	*
Mt. San Antonio	250	3.70	5.00	5.00
Mt. San Jacinto	38	2.75	3.47	6.02
Napa	89	3.00	2.00	2.13
North Orange	456	2.50	6.80	7.00
Palo Verde	10	5.00	6.00	*
Palomar	237	4.00	6.00	6.44
Pasadena Area	290	5.00	5.00	6.00

(continued)

DISPLAY 7, continued

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1984-85	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1985-86	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1986-87
Peralta	365	4.00%	5.00%	7.00%
Rancho Santiago	264	10.00	3.50	6.01
Redwoods	80	3.10	4.40	5.30
Rio Hondo	156	8.00	6.20	5.00
Riverside	149	6.00	6.50	*
Saddleback	220	8.50	*	*
San Bernardino	N/A	0.00	8.00	8.00
San Diego	418	6.00	5.00	6.00
San Diego Adult	88	3.00	5.00	*
San Francisco Centers	237	5.00	5.00	6.50
San Francisco	360	5.00	5.00	6.50
San Joaquin Delta	204	7.00	7.50	10.00
San Jose	211	4.20	5.00	5.00
San Luis Obispo	66	4.52	4.52	4.59
San Mateo	368	3.56	5.00	4.00
Santa Barbara	167	9.50	8.00	*
Santa Clarita	47	4.00	6.00	7.00
Santa Monica	194	6.00	6.00	5.00
Sequoias	121	-5.00	5.00	6.00
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	112	4.50	4.00	8.00
Sierra	115	5.00	8.00	6.14
Siskiyou	44	3.50	5.00	5.00
Solano County	124	12.90	8.06	6.00
Sonoma County	209	2.50	7.50	4.00
South County	213	6.00	5.00	5.50
Southwestern	167	3.00	5.00	8.00
State Center	260	0.00	6.00	5.00
Ventura County	337	6.00	6.00	4.00
Victor Valley	59	5.00	4.25	*
West Hills	39	3.00	5.00	5.00
West Kern	22	6.00	5.00	5.00
West Valley	234	0.60	10.20	5.00
Yosemite	209	4.00	5.00	8.00
Yuba	105	4.87	6.32	*
Number of Districts Reporting	--	70	68	54
Total/Mean -- Excluding San Diego Evening and San Francisco Centers	13,408	5.06%	5.04%	5.50%
Total/Mean -- Including San Diego Evening and San Francisco Centers	13,733	5.04%	5.04%	5.52%

* District was still in salary negotiations at the time of the Chancellery's deadline for submitting data.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellery.

DISPLAY 8 Sonoma County Junior College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1986-87

Step	Class I BA	Class II BA + 30	Class III MA	Class IV MA +20 or BA +55 with MA	Class V MA +40 or BA +75 with MA	Class VI Doctorate
1	$22,357	$22,717	$23,799	$25,688	$27,576	$28,476
2	23,529	23,918	25,085	27,068	29,050	29,950
3	24,702	25,119	26,371	28,448	30,524	31,424
4	25,874	26,320	27,657	29,828	31,998	32,898
5	27,047	27,521	28,943	31,208	33,472	34,372
6	28,219	28,722	30,229	32,588	34,946	35,846
7	29,392	29,923	31,516	33,968	36,420	37,320
8	30,564	31,124	32,802	35,348	37,894	38,794
9	31,737	32,325	34,088	36,728	39,368	40,268
10	32,909	33,526	35,374	38,108	40,842	41,742
11			36,660	39,488	42,316	43,216
12			37,946	40,868	43,790	44,690
16	Professional Growth*			41,868	44,790	45,690
20	Professional Growth*				45,790	46,690
24	Professional Growth*				46,790	47,690

* Professional growth increments of $1,000 at:
  1. The sixteenth step with ten years of service at Santa Rosa Junior College and 15 approved growth units earned after Step 12 placement.
  2. The twentieth step with a minimum of four years service and 15 additional approved growth units earned after Step 16 placement.
  3. The twenty-fourth step with a minimum of four years service ant 15 additional approved growth units earned after Step 20 placement.

Credits utilized to attain Professional Growth Increments MAY NOT be used for Class advancement.

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellery.

Items 7 and 8 in Display 9 compare the estimate of compensation per WFCH for full-time faculty with the actual data reported for part-time and overload faculty. Also on a systemwide basis, these comparisons show full-time faculty in 1986-87 earning just over twice as much per WFCH as part-time faculty, and about 78 percent more than the amount paid for overload assignments.

Summary

In the current year, regular and contract faculty were reported to be earning an average salary of $38,005, an amount that is probably understated by 3 or 4 percent, since only 31 districts reported complete data in time for inclusion in the Chancellery's report. Twenty-two other districts reported the percentage amount of the cost-of-living adjustment but could not include the increase in their mean salary figures. Sixteen districts were still in the process of negotiating current-year increases and thus could not report a COLA figure. One district – San Bernardino, reported its COLA -- but no other information. Most of the sixteen districts reporting no COLA are likely to approve some increase in salary for all faculty. For the 54 districts that did report COLA data, the average increase for 1986-87 was about 5.5 percent, once off-schedule adjustments are included. This compares to a comparable COLA of 5.0 percent in 1985-86.

DISPLAY 9 *Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1980 to Fall 1986*

Item	Fall 1980[1]	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983	Fall 1984	Fall 1985	Fall 1986
1. Number							
Full-Time Faculty[2]	9,814	9,716	9,160	9,871	9,121	9,161	8,981
Part-Time Faculty	29,255	26,513	24,115	21,924	22,810	23,790	23,795
Overload Faculty	6,260	5,664	5,514	5,225	5,370	5,276	5,101
2. Total WFCH Taught							
Full-Time Faculty	261,821	220,695	229,958	200,674	211,130	209,608	211,769
Part-Time Faculty	149,761	140,338	125,923	116,749	122,063	127,570	129,659
Overload Faculty	23,391	26,558	25,402	24,088	24,620	24,180	23,764
3. Percentage Distribution of WFCH Taught							
Full-Time Faculty	60.0%	56.9%	60.3%	58.8%	59.0%	58.0%	58.0%
Part-Time Faculty	34.3	36.2	33.0	34.2	34.1	35.3	35.5
Overload Faculty	5.7	6.9	6.7	7.1	6.9	6.7	6.5
4. Mean WFCH Taught							
Full-Time Faculty[3]	16.3	14.3	15.7	13.3	14.6	14.5	15.0
Part-Time Faculty	5.1	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.8	5.4
Overload Faculty	4.0	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7
5. Mean Dollars Paid per WFCH							
Part-Time Faculty	$19.87	$20.50	$21.74	$22.41	$23.20	$24.32	$25.50
Overload Faculty	23.22	22.65	25.69	26.09	27.19	28.80	30.34
6. Compensation of Overload Faculty as a Percentage of Part-Time Faculty	116.9%	110.5%	118.2%	116.4%	117.2%	118.4%	119.0%
7. Mean Dollars Paid to Contract and Regular Faculty per WFCH, Assuming No Overload Assignments[4]							
Unadjusted	$49.56	$53.52	$56.55	$58.01	$59.99	$63.85	$72.02
Adjusted[5]	37.17	40.14	42.41	43.51	44.99	47.89	54.02
8. Compensation of Full-Time Faculty (Adjusted in Item 7) as a Percentage of Part-Time and Overload Faculty per WFCH							
Part-Time Faculty	187.1%	195.8%	195.1%	194.2%	193.9%	196.9%	211.8%
Overload Faculty	160.1	177.2	165.1	166.8	165.5	166.3	178.0

1. Number of faculty and WFCH taught are estimated.
2. No overload.
3. Full-time faculty teaching regular assignments only.
4. Based on a 35-week year.
5. Dollar amount reduced by 25 percent to reflect additional responsibilities of regular and contract faculty such as counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellery.

Part-time faculty continue to be paid about half the amount paid to full-time faculty on a per-contact-hour basis, and the difference between them has increased slightly over the past six years. The number of part-time faculty employed has declined by 19 percent since 1980 -- from 29,255 to 23,795 -- but increased by 9 percent from its recent low in 1983 of 21,924. The relative shares of contact hours taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and full-time faculty teaching overloads has not changed appreciably over the six year period surveyed in this report.

The lack of complete mean salary data continues to be a problem with the Chancellery's Staff Data File, one that is probably unsolvable given the length of many collective bargaining negotiations and the early spring deadline for the Chancellery's report. In the coming year, Commission staff will explore improvements in this process with the Chancellery, with particular attention given to the possibility of moving the deadline to a later date or compiling a supplemental report.

3 *Selected Administrators' Salaries at the University of California and the California State University*

DURING the 1981 Legislative Session, the Budget Conference Committee adopted the following Supplemental Language to the Budget Bill:

> It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Postsecondary Education Commission include in its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefits comparative information on salaries of administrators within the University of California and the California State University.

Since 1981-82, the University and the State University have collected data from their comparison institutions and forwarded them to the Commission for analysis. The Commission has then included them in its report, together with additional data from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). In this way, it has become possible to present a comparison between California's public institutions and those in the rest of the nation for a representative sample of administrative positions.

For several years, there was a lack of consensus as to which positions should be surveyed, which comparisons were valid, and which comparison institutions should be surveyed. Initially, in 1981-82, a list of 25 administrative titles was selected from the list of 130 position descriptions developed by CUPA, a number that was reduced to as few as 15 in 1983-84. During the past year, the Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology discussed the issue of administrators' salaries and compiled a list that should remain constant for the foreseeable future. That list includes 18 campus-based positions at both the University of California and the California State University, plus twelve and ten central office positions from the respective central offices. It was also agreed that the same group of comparison institutions used for faculty analyses should be used for administrators, but only for the campus-based positions. Central office salaries are to be reported, but without reference to other systems across the country.

In past reports, the Commission has always included data from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). Unfortunately, the 1986-87 CUPA Annual Report had not been published as of this writing, so data from that source could not be presented in this report.

University of California

Display 10 on page 18 shows the data submitted by the University of California and its comparison institutions for campus-based positions in 1986-87. Central office administrative positions are shown in Display 12 on page 20.

Display 10 shows that University of California campus-based administrators are paid between 0.0 and 8.3 percent more than their comparison institution counterparts in 7 of the 18 position categories surveyed, and between 0.8 and 20.9 percent less in the remaining 11. Where the salary difference is greater than 5 percent, 2 are paid more and 7 less. Where the increases exceed 10 percent, the University pays less in each case (director of library services (-14.4%), director of the computer center (-11.0%), dean of arts and sciences (-10.5%), and dean of business (-20.9%). Chancellors are paid 4.2 percent less than the comparison institution average.

The California State University

The California State University also surveyed 18 campus-based positions, as shown in Display 11 on page 19, with 10 central office administrators' salaries shown in Display 12. For the campus-based positions, the State University pays between 2.8 and 22.9 percent more for 6 position titles, and between 0.6 and 12.1 percent less for 12 position titles. The State University consistently pays substantially more than its comparison universities to the director of campus security, the director of institutional research, the director of student financial aid, and the

DISPLAY 10 Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1986-87

Administrative Title	University of California Average	Comparison Institution Average	UC Exceeds Comp. Group by:
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution	$113,667	$118,639	-4.2
Chief Academic Officer	102,689	102,640	0.0
Chief Business Officer	95,238	94,874	0.4
Director, Personnel/Human Resources	71,844	75,277	-4.6
Chief Budgeting Officer	73,088	70,136	4.2
Director, Library Services	77,878	90,942	-14.4
Director, Computer Center	61,794	69,456	-11.0
Chief, Physical Plant	71,733	71,925	0.6
Director, Campus Security	59,078	60,597	-2.5
Director, Information Systems	72,489	78,510	-7.7
Director, Student Financial Aid	58,223	53,754	8.3
Director, Athletics	86,327	80,349	7.4
Dean of Agriculture	96,767	102,867	-5.9
Dean of Arts and Sciences	89,594	100,119	-10.5
Dean of Business	89,040	112,560	-20.9
Dean of Education	86,625	87,347	-0.8
Dean of Engineering	98,254	103,408	-5.0
Dean of Graduate Programs	90,567	88,980	1.8

Note: Comparison institutions include Cornell University (Endowed), Harvard University, Stanford University, Yale University, University of Illinois (Urbana), University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), University of Wisconsin (Madison), and the State University of New York (Buffalo).

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

director of athletics, and consistently less to all of its deans. In the dean category, the greatest divergence is for dean of business (11.8 percent below the comparison group), with the least for dean of engineering (4.1 percent less). State University presidents ($98,568) are currently paid 12.1 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts.

DISPLAY 11 Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1986-87

Administrative Title	No. of CSU Inst.	California State University Average	No. of Comp. Inst.	Comparison Institution Average	CSU Exceeds Comp. Group by:
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution (President)	19	$98,568	17	$112,122	-12.1%
Chief Academic Officer	19	82,321	16	92,823	-11.3
Chief Business Officer	17	69,120	15	76,873	-10.1
Director, Personnel/Human Resources	16	55,900	15	54,354	2.8
Director of Libraries	18	64,351	16	62,884	-2.3
Director of Computer Center	14	61,277	8	57,152	7.2
Director of Physical Plant	17	55,866	15	56,202	-0.6
Director of Campus Security	18	51,783	16	42,151	22.9
Director of Institutional Research	12	59,878	10	49,921	19.9
Director of Student Financial Aid	16	52,871	17	44,944	17.6
Director, Athletics	14	64,678	14	57,258	13.0
Dean of Agriculture	3	70,968	4	75,527	-6.0
Dean of Arts and Sciences	15	69,090	13	75,601	-8.6
Dean of Business	17	70,084	12	79,425	-11.8
Dean of Education	14	68,561	12	71,562	-4.2
Dean of Engineering	11	76,337	13	79,641	-4.1
Dean of Graduate Programs	11	66,577	12	69,488	-4.2

Note: Comparison institutions include Arizona State University, University of Bridgeport, Bucknell University (Pa.), Cleveland State University, University of Colorado (Denver), Georgia State University, Loyola University (Chicago), Mankato State University, University of Maryland (Baltimore), University of Nevada (Reno), North Carolina State University, Reed College, Rutgers University (Newark), State University of New York (Albany), University of Southern California, University of Texas (Arlington), Tufts University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Wayne State University, and University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee).

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

DISPLAY 12 Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, 1986-87

Administrative Title and Number of Positions	University of California	Range of Increase Over 1985-86	Administrative Title and Number of Positions	The California State University	Increase Over 1985-86
President (1)	$189,100	6.1%	Chancellor (1)	$121,255	8.1
Senior Vice Presidents (2)	117,500	6.1	Vice Chancellor and Provost (1)	105,890	10.6
Vice Presidents (3)[1]	102,500 to 105,500	6.3 to 6.8	Vice Chancellors (3)	104,392	5.0
Associate Vice Presidents (3)	85,200 to 97,000	5.1 to 9.9	Associate Vice Chancellor (1)	80,556	5.0
Assistant Vice-Presidents (11)	72,600 to 96,200	5.0 to 9.9	Assistant Vice Chancellors (4)	78,333	5.0
Director of State Governmental Relations (1)	80,500	8.1	Director of Governmental Affairs (1)	89,976	5.0
University Auditor (1)	73,000	6.1	University Auditor (1)	86,448	5.0
General Counsel (1)[1]	120,000	--	General Counsel (1)	104,392	5.0
Associate General Counsel (vacant)	--	--	Associate General Counsel (1)	81,096	5.0
Treasurer (1)	138,000	11.1	Deputy Provost (1)	92,196	5.0
Associate Treasurer (1)	115,500	6.0			
Secretary to the Regents (1)	87,000	6.2			

1. One Vice President whose salary is $102,500 and the General Counsel were new appointees in 1986-87. Their salaries are included in the 1986-87 salary range but are not included in the category of range of increase over 1985-86.

Source: University of California, Office of the President, and The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

4 *Medical Faculty Salaries at the University of California*

SUPPLEMENTAL Language to the 1978 Budget Act provided that:

> The University of California shall report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission annually on (1) its full-time clinical faculty salaries and those of its comparison institutions (including a description of the type of compensation plans utilized by each UC school and each comparison institution), and (2) the number of compensation plan exceptions in effect at each UC school.

In 1979, the University selected eight comparison institutions -- Stanford; the State University of New York's (SUNY) Upstate Medical School; the Universities of Chicago, Illinois (Chicago), Michigan (Ann Arbor), Texas (Houston), Wisconsin (Madison); and Yale -- five of which were also on the comparison list for regular faculty -- and also explained the procedures used to compensate faculty physicians (Appendix B). Subsequently, due to data collection problems, SUNY's Upstate Medical School was replaced by the University of North Carolina's medical school at Chapel Hill.

Since the first report was published by the Commission in 1979, salary data have been included for general medicine, surgery, and pediatrics that, taken together, have been used to represent all medical disciplines. In addition, the University has provided an overview of the various clinical compensation plans employed by its comparison group, as well as its own procedures for compensating medical faculty.

In 1985, the Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology, which included representatives from the Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, the segments, and the Commission, agreed that while the medical faculty salary report was useful to complete the picture of faculty salaries generally, there was little need to provide it on an annual basis. This conclusion stemmed from the dual facts that University physicians are paid by the State on the same schedule as regular 11-month faculty on the general campuses, and that previous reports had not resulted in any changes in fiscal or programmatic policy at the medical schools. Accordingly, the advisory committee, and subsequently the Commission, agreed to biennial submissions of the salary data.

Displays 13, 14, and 15 on pp. 22-23 show 1986-87 University of California and comparison institution data in the three specialties noted above. These data indicate that University medical faculty exceed the mean compensation at their comparison institutions by between 1.7 and 16.6 percent in eight of the nine categories shown, the only exception being associate professors of surgery who are currently paid 4.4 percent less. In the three specialties, professors lead by an average of 11.0 percent, associate professors by 1.1 percent, and assistant professors by 6.6 percent.

The University's medical faculty rank fourth, second, and second at the professor, associate professor and assistant professor ranks, respectively, in general medicine; third, fifth, and third in surgery; and second, second, and first in pediatrics. This is a slight improvement in the University's position between 1981-82 and 1984-85, and brings the medical faculty closer to the relationship it had with the comparison group in 1979-80 and 1980-81. The University's position for each rank and specialty in six of the past eight years is shown in Display 16.

DISPLAY 13 University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1986-87 (General Medicine)

Institution Code	Rank	Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor
D	1	$136,434	1	$115,737	1	$85,175
B	2	133,400	4	88,100	8	64,270
F	3	118,664	6	84,324	6	67,793
University of California	**4**	**117,032**	**2**	**89,873**	**2**	**73,488**
A	5	110,075	8	81,533	4	69,860
G	6	104,636	3	89,389	7	66,233
E	7	102,759	9	81,329	9	58,629
C	8	102,652	5	84,800	3	71,667
H	9	96,192	7	81,942	5	69,849
Comparison Institution Mean Salary[1]		$113,102		$88,394		$69,185
Standard Deviation		$14,978		$11,444		$7,644
Percentage by which UC Exceeds Comparison Institution Mean Salary		3.5%		1.7%		6.2%

1. Equal weight to each comparison institution.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

DISPLAY 14 University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1986-87 (Surgery)

Institution Code	Rank	Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor
D	1	$203,162	3	$143,444	2	$114,338
G	2	198,611	2	149,900	6	95,948
University of California	**3**	**195,949**	**5**	**131,638**	**3**	**108,720**
C	4	181,251	1	197,500	1	151,000
A	5	158,310	8	118,567	5	98,478
F	6	154,338	7	120,919	4	99,595
B	7	154,125	4	141,333	8	92,286
H	8	149,027	9	100,704	9	83,828
E	9	146,156	6	129,488	7	92,486
Comparison Institution Mean Salary[1]		$168,123		$137,732		$103,495
Standard Deviation		$22,863		$28,921		$21,062
Percentage by which UC Exceeds Comparison Institution Mean Salary		16.6%		-4.4%		3.1%

1. Equal weight to each comparison institution.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

DISPLAY 15 University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1986-87 (Pediatrics)

Institution Code	Rank	Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor
B	1	$130,250	1	$88,630	6	$60,750
University of California	**2**	**110,656**	**2**	**83,961**	**1**	**68,509**
F	3	109,483	5	77,103	2	67,117
A	4	101,683	6	76,393	4	63,109
D	5	98,357	4	77,241	5	62,068
C	6	94,667	3	81,500	3	66,200
G	7	92,962	8	69,667	7	58,871
E	8	91,709	7	75,540	9	53,179
H	9	85,029	9	61,293	8	53,703
Comparison Institution Mean Salary[1]		$100,518		$75,921		$60,625
Standard Deviation		$14,037		$8,011		$5,181
Percentage by which UC Exceeds Comparison Institution Mean Salary		10.1%		10.6%		13.0%

1. Equal weight to each comparison institution.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

DISPLAY 16 Ranking of University of California Medical Faculty Compensation in Relation to the Amounts Paid at its Comparison Institutions, Selected Years from 1979-80 to 1986-87

Specialty and Academic Rank	Position in Relation to the Eight Comparison Institutions					
	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1984-85	1986-87
General Medicine						
Professor	2	3	3	4	4	4
Associate Professor	2	4	4	6	4	2
Assistant Professor	2	2	4	4	3	2
Surgery						
Professor	2	3	2	4	3	3
Associate Professor	4	3	4	5	6	5
Assistant Professor	5	5	5	4	6	3
Pediatrics						
Professor	3	1	2	3	3	2
Associate Professor	3	2	2	4	3	2
Assistant Professor	2	4	3	6	5	1

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

Appendix A

Letter from Kenneth B. O'Brien to Gerald Hayward, August 9, 1979

August 9, 1979

Gerald Hayward
Director of Legislative and Public Affairs
California Community Colleges
1238 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Jerry:

As you know, the Legislature took several actions during the current session concerning the reporting of salary data. The first of these emanated from the Legislative Analyst's report and requires the Commission to include the Community Colleges in our annual reports on University of California and California State University and Colleges faculty salaries. The second action appropriated $15,000 to the Chancellor's Office for the purpose of collecting salary data for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 fiscal years. The latter action, however, did not specify the type of information to be collected.

It is my understanding that you discussed this subject with Bill Storey and agreed that we should develop a detailed list of the information we will require for our report. After that, I presume you will contact us if there are any questions or ambiguities.

Our questions fall into three categories: (1) full-time faculty, (2) part-time faculty, and (3) administrators. For each of these, we will need the following:

Full-time faculty

1. A listing of all salary classifications (e.g. BA + 30, MA, etc.) for each Community College District.
2. The actual salary at each step of each classification.
3. The number of faculty at each step of each classification.
4. The amounts of any bonuses that are granted to faculty, the number of faculty receiving them, the total salary of every faculty member receiving a bonus, and the reason for granting the bonus.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.
6. The total number of full-time faculty in each district.
7. The mean salary received by those full-time faculty.
8. The total dollar amount paid to full-time faculty as a group.

Part-time faculty

1. The total number of part-time faculty employed by each district on both a headcount and full-time-equivalent (FTE) basis.
2. The mean salary paid to each headcount faculty member in each district.
3. The mean salary paid to each FTE faculty member in each district.

4. The total dollar amount paid to all part-time faculty in each district.
5. A summary of the compensation plan for part-time faculty members in each district.

Administrators

1. A list of all administrative positions (titles) in each district.
2. The salary schedule for each position.
3. The number of headcount and FTE employees occupying each administrative position.
4. The actual salary paid to each employee in each administrative position.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.

A few words of explanation may be in order. The data requested for full-time faculty are very similar to those that have been collected by the Chancellor's Office for a number of years but which were not collected for 1978-79 due to Proposition 13 reductions. The only major difference relates to the detail on bonuses that was not clearly presented in prior reports.

We are asking for data on part-time faculty because of objections raised by Community College representatives. At the time our preliminary report on Community College salaries was presented, many Community College representatives, including those from the Chancellor's Office, complained that the data were misleading because part-time faculty were not included. To avoid that difficulty in the future, it is imperative that data on these faculty be included in next year's report to the Legislature.

We are also asking for data on administrators because of the concerns expressed by both the Legislature (on the subject of academic administration generally) and various Community College faculty organizations. I am not sure we will publish any of the data on administrators but we do want to be able to respond to questions should they arise.

The final item concerns the dates for receipt of the data. As you know, we publish two salary reports each year. Since the University and the State University report to us each year by November 1, we think it would be appropriate to set November 1 as a reporting date (for the 1978-79 data) for the Chancellor's Office as well. For the 1979-80 data, we would like to have a report by March 1 so that we may include it in our final report to the Legislature. In future years, the March 1 date should become permanent.

If you have any questions concerning any of these matters, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Kenneth B. O'Brien, Jr.
Associate Director

KBOB:mc

Appendix B

Office of the President
March, 1979

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

REPORT ON MEDICAL SCHOOL CLINICAL COMPENSATION PLANS AND

CLINICAL FACULTY SALARIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. CLINICAL COMPENSATION PLANS

General 1

University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan 3

Comparison Data Survey 4

Selection of Comparison Institutions 5

II. COMPENSATION SURVEY 6

Data Collection 6

Selection of Departments and Disciplines 7

The Method 7

Results of the Clinical Salary Comparison and University of California Standing in Each Category 8

III. EXCEPTIONS TO THE PLAN 9

TABLES

1. Comparison Institutions - Medical Schools 10
2. Medical Practice Plan Typology (Chart) 11
3. Medicine Department Average Salary 12
4. Pediatrics Department Average Salary 13
5. Surgery Department Average Salary 14

APPENDICES

A. Explanation of Medical School Faculty Salary Survey Conducted by the University of California With the Eight Participating Comparison Medical Schools 16

B. Brief Descriptions of the Medical Compensation Plans at the Eight Comparison Medical Schools 19

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Report on Medical School Clinical Compensation Plans and Clinical Faculty Salaries

This report responds to Item 322 of the 1978 Conference Committee's Supplemental Report on the Budget Bill which recommends that:

> UC shall report to CPEC annually on (1) its full-time clinical faculty salaries and those of its comparison institutions (including a description of the type of compensation plans utilized by each UC school and each comparison institution) and (2) the number of compensation plan exceptions in effect at each UC school.

This report discusses the issues in the above supplemental language by providing:

1. a description of the type of compensation plans utilized by each UC school and each comparison institution (Section I);
2. a discussion of the University's full-time clinical faculty salaries and those of its comparison institutions (Section II); and
3. a report on compensation plan exceptions (Section III).

I. Clinical Compensation Plans

General

Clinical compensation plans are compensation arrangements created by medical schools to provide competitive income for physicians and other faculty with direct patient-care responsibility as well as to further the academic goals of the medical schools. As stated by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) in their December, 1977 report on An In-Depth Study of Seven Medical Practice Plans,

> "The most commonly stated plan objective is the attraction and retention of quality faculty through the provision of acceptable compensation levels not achievable through other salary sources. An additional objec-

tive quite prevalent among the . . . plans is the use of plan revenue to help achieve departmental and schoolwide program enrichment with stable, flexible funds."

The AAMC reviewed the medical practice plans of the 112 M.D. degree-granting fully acredited medical schools in the U.S. and concluded that the plans could be characterized by the degree of central control exercised over the details of the plans' operations, along a "centralized/decentralized" axis. A summary of the three basic types of clinical compensation plans was developed by the AAMC as follows:

Type A - a highly centralized compensation approach, characterized by two basic and interrelated features. First, all patient-care fees are collected and deposited to central accounts, usually with few references to the origin of the bill beyond the requirements of accurate bookkeeping and physician liability and accountability for services rendered. Second, physicians are placed on either individually set or departmentally fixed incomes based on a predetermined compensation schedule which recognizes such features as academic rank, previous or current clinical services, and additional merit or service features.

Type B - an intermediate arrangement in which some common policy framework exists for patient-care fee collection and disbursement. In this approach a general policy is set for all medical school faculty with patient-care responsibilities, requiring that they follow specified billing and collection procedures through a central office or departmental offices. Compensation is determined by a formula which recognizes the productivity of patient-care activities as well as academic factors such as rank and scholarship. Such compensation arrangements usually set broad ranges for total compensation, recognizing the aforementioned features, with set maxima either by department, school, or specialty.

Type C - the least disciplined arrangement, which allows wide variation by individual department or among specialties as to how patient-care fees are collected and subsequently distributed. The most extreme example permits the faculty member to bill and retain virtually all of the billable practice income with some requirement to reimburse the institution for overhead cost (office space, hospital fees, etc.).

Table 2 (p. 11), provides a further description of this medical practice plan typology, indicating by directional arrows the kind of movement that typically occurs in the organization of a practice plan--from no plan to decentralized, to intermediate, and to centralized.

University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan

The University of California uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan, approved by The Regents in November, 1977 for implementation in 1978, falls within the Type B category. It provides a uniform framework for patient-care billing and sets uniform compensation maxima based on academic rank and step. The Plan provides sufficient flexibility so that specific parameters for the various medical specialties or disciplines within the same department may be established as long as the maximum compensation arrangements established by the Plan are not exceeded.

The key features of this Plan are:

1. The eleven-month regular faculty salary scale approved by The Regents for each faculty rank forms the base salary for all medical school ladder rank faculty. There is no differential in the base salary between medical school faculty and general campus faculty.
2. Arrangements for compensation in addition to the base salary are limited to three types.
   a. Negotiated Income - This is an amount of additional compensation

determined by a department or school that a clinician can earn via contribution of income from patient-care (and certain other specified income sources) to a group or pooled income system. There is an absolute ceiling on this amount, as discussed below.

b. Income Limitation Arrangements - These are arrangements whereby the faculty member may retain, subject to assessments, income directly from patient-care activities. Assessments are progressive and reach a nearly confiscatory level at approximately three times the faculty member's base salary.

c. Combination Plans - These are arrangements whereby faculty members share a predetermined portion of a pooled amount and are allowed to retain individual earnings beyond that amount up to a maximum ceiling.

3. Membership in this Plan is mandatory for all clinical faculty with patient-care responsibility who hold an appointment at 50% or more time, and all income from professional services performed by these faculty is subject to the terms of the Plan.

4. Accounting standards and monitoring practices are specified in the guidelines for implementation of this Plan. Along with the Plan and guidelines, accounting procedures have been developed which are consistent with the Plan objectives.

Comparison Data Survey

One of the principal features of the uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan is a provision for periodic review of the established compensation maxima. In Section IV (Compensation), which sets forth the formulae for deriving maximum compensation, provision IV.B.6 states:

Compensation levels and assessment rates will be reviewed periodically by the Vice President--Academic and Staff Personnel Relations in light of comparison data from University of California Medical Schools as

well as from other comparison institutions. On the basis of the Vice President's report, the President, after consultation with the Academic Senate, may recommend adjustments in the compensation levels in this Plan to The Regents.

A set of comparison institutions was selected and a statistical method adopted that would yield the requisite data to satisfy this provision of the Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan as well as the requirement for an annual report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Selection of Comparison Institutions

Eight institutions that represent comparable programs were selected from public and private sectors. Five of the institutions are public in character and three are private. The institutions selected represent a diverse spectrum and sufficient variation of settings and practice plan arrangements to provide valid comparisons. Appendix B (see pp. 19-20) provides a brief description of the various compensation plans used by the comparison institutions.

Comparison Institutions

Name	Public or Private	Compensation Plan
*Stanford	Private	yes
State Univ. of New York-Upstate Medical School	Public	yes
Univ. of Chicago	Private	yes
*Univ. of Illinois	Public	no
*Univ. of Michigan	Public	yes
Univ. of Texas, Houston	Public	yes
*Univ. of Wisconsin	Public	yes
*Yale University	Private	yes

The comparison institutions included five that are also in the general campus survey (noted by asterisks). In addition, the University of Texas, Houston, and the State University of New York-Upstate Medical School were selected because they are part of larger multicampus systems with more than one medical school.

II. Compensation Survey

A. Data Collection

Compensation plan information was obtained from the eight comparison medical schools by means of a questionnaire (see Appendix A, pp. 16-18). The questionnaire was followed by phone calls, and a special meeting which took place during the October, 1978 meeting of the AAMC in New Orleans. At that special meeting of the comparison schools, there was an extended discussion of the practical aspects of medical salary and practice plan management, and arrangements were made to meet and/or consult each year and to regularly exchange data. Further, Mr. William L. Storey, Higher Education specialist with the California Postsecondary Education Commission, was consulted about this comparison study, and has agreed to meet to discuss in detail the methodology and conclusions.

B. Selection of Departments and Disciplines

Comparison of medical schools' salaries raises problems which do not occur in comparing salaries of general campuses. On general university campuses, overall salary averages for a given professorial rank are a good reflection of what the individual faculty member is actually paid at that rank. In medical schools, however, there is great variation in individual salaries, and an overall salary average for a given medical school is statistically unreliable. For that reason, it was not possible to use overall salary averages from the comparison medical schools in

this study. Statistics from the annual AAMC report of clinical salaries were similarly of little utility since they tend to aggregate salaries from a variety of clinicians, both full and part-time, without sufficient disaggregation in the sample to make the data useful for this survey. The method that was devised to avoid the above problems was to select a stratified sample of three clinical specialties which are commonly found in schools of medicine and which typically represent a range of compensation within medical schools. The three clinical specialties selected are (a) Pediatrics, typically at a lower level of compensation; (b) Medicine, typically at a mid-level compensation; and (c) Surgery, typically at a higher compensation. These three clinical specialties are taken as representative of the medical schools at large and are used as the base for developing the data for this study. The salary data received from the thirteen medical schools (five from UC and eight from comparison insitutions) are treated as follows: a single weighted-average compensation is constructed from the five UC medical school responses for each of the three specialties. That weighted average is displayed in a ranked table (ranked by professorial compensation) together with the responses from the eight comparison medical schools (see Tables 3, 4, and 5, pp. 12, 13, and 14).

C. The Method

For each of the specialties a simple average of the resulting table of nine weighted averages is then calculated, as well as the standard deviation, and entered at the bottom of each of Table 3, 4 and 5. The single average for the five medical schools is examined in each of the three ranked tables to determine where that average falls within the sample of nine weighted averages; i.e., whether or not that particular average deviates significantly from the general average. The

tables reflect the following:

a. where the UC average falls within one standard deviation;

b. where the UC average is with respect to the average for the group as a whole; and

c. whether the UC average is within one standard deviation of the group average.

If the UC average is, in fact, within one standard deviation from the group average, then the UC average can be considered to be not statistically different from that of the group as a whole.

D. Results of the Clinical Salary Comparison and University of California Standing in Each Category

Tables 3, 4, and 5 (see pp. 12, 13, and 14) indicate that the University's average compensation is consistent with the overall average for each specialty, as displayed below:

AVERAGE FULL PROFESSOR COMPENSATION - ABSTRACTED FROM TABLES 3, 4, 5.

Medicine		Pediatrics		Surgery	
High	67,000	High	67,000	High	88,000
Average	60,440	UC	59,000	Average	79,440
UC	59,000	Average	57,560	UC	75,000
Low	54,000	Low	51,000	Low	67,000

From the table above, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. In Medicine (Table 3, p.12), average professorial compensation ranges from a high of $67,000 per year to a low of $54,000, with an average of $60,440. The UC average for Medicine is $59,000, slightly below the group average.

2. In Pediatrics (Table 4, p.13), average professorial compensation ranges

from a high of $67,000 per year to a low of $51,000, with an average of $57,560. The UC average for Pediatrics is $59,000, slightly (but not significantly) higher than the group average (within one standard deviation from the average).

3. In Surgery (Table 5, p. 15), average professorial compensation ranges from a high of $88,000 per year to a low of $67,000, with an average of $79,440. The UC average for Surgery is $75,000, somewhat (but not significantly) below the group average.

Within each of the three specialties, the spread of salaries is not great, supporting the assumption that the selected medical schools are comparable. In each of the tables for the three specialties, the University's average compensation is close to the overall average, as is displayed in the table above. For these reasons, the compensation being paid in University of California medical schools can be considered to be representative, competitive and appropriate. Therefore, there appears to be no need at this time to alter the current compensation formulas.

III. Exceptions to the Plan

Requests for exceptions, including individual exceptions, to the Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan may originate with the individual department, and, subject to approval by the Dean, are then forwarded to the campus Chancellor for the next approval step. The Chancellor then consults with the campus Academic Senate. If the Chancellor approves the exception, the request is recommended to the President for final approval. All approved exceptions to compensation limits must be reported to the Board of Regents.

As part of the implementation of the Plan it was agreed that certain limited existing arrangements would be permitted to continue. Other than these exceptions, no individual exceptions have been made. Irvine has been permitted to delay implementation of the Plan until January, 1980 in order to accommodate the campus conversion from a gross to a net clinical fee compensation plan.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS - MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Stanford University

State University of New York -
Upstate Medical School

University of Chicago

University of Illinois

University of Michigan

University of Texas, Houston

University of Wisconsin

Yale University

TABLE 2

MEDICAL PRACTICE PLAN TYPOLOGY

PLAN FEATURES	TYPE A Centralized ←	TYPE B Intermediate	→ TYPE C Decentralized
Organization & Participation			
• Structure	A discretely recognized entity, either within or external to the medical school, having its own personnel, budget and procedural guidelines.	A common framework for clinical practice activity exists within which departmental or specialty groups function.	A variety of clinical practice arrangements for academic departments or medical specialties are permitted.
• Policy Determination	All practicing clinicians are included and directly and/or indirectly through their representatives meet with institutional officials to focus only on clinical practice - related issues.	Most clinical disciplines are participants in deliberations about clinical practice - related issues identified by institutional officials.	Executive faculty and the dean consult as necessary during the routine conduct of general meetings.
Operations			
• Administration	A full-time manager supervises the day-to-day plan operation with responsibility for all administrative services supporting the practice of medicine.	A member of the dean's regular administrative staff is the locus for coordination of many plan support services.	Either the department head or his designate directs administrative support services.
• Fee Handling	All clinical practice related revenue flows through the Plan Office which renders bills, collects fees and disburses income.	Uniform procedures for billing, collection and disbursement of fees are implemented.	Options for billing, collection or disbursement of fees are available to academic departments or medical specialties.
Private Medical Schools	12	10	3
Public Medical Schools	21	16	5

The above table is taken from An In-Depth Study of Seven Medical Practice Plans--Association of American Medical Colleges, December, 1977, p. 14.

The arrows show the kind of movement that typically occurs in the organization of a practice plan, from no plan, to decentralized, to intermediate, and to centralized.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Annual Medical School Faculty Salary Survey

Instructions

The form will be provided for three departments only, General Medicine, Pediatrics, and Surgery. Three categories of compensation are identified with definitions. These are:

1. Base or Guaranteed Component - the base salary derived from University of California salary scales for that rank and guaranteed by the University exclusive of fringe benefits;
2. University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation, or expected compensation, not including the base salary described in 1, above, which is received through or as a result of the operation of, and the individual faculty member's participation in, the University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan, and
3. Grand Total Compensation - the sum of the monies associated with items 1 and 2 above, divided by the head count for that line of the questionnaire.

In each case, one calculates the average for each box in the questionnaire by totalling all the monies involved in that category and then by dividing by the head count for that line of the questionnaire. Reasonable estimates of the year's earnings should be reported or last year's actual earnings with any estimated increment. Please specify the method used in the "comments" section at the bottom of each questionnaire.

For the departments specified above, include only 12 month salaries for full-time paid faculty utilizing September 1 budget figures whenever possible. Include the full salary of faculty on sabbatical leave. Exclude those faculty at affiliated institutions, full salary for vacant positions, house staff and fellows in all ranks and part-time and volunteer faculty.

Attached is a list of the subspecialties to be included within three departments (General Medicine, Pediatrics and Surgery). If you have any questions, please phone R.D. Manhenett at (415):642-1454.

SURGERY	MEDICINE	PEDIATRICS
GENERAL SURGERY	GENERAL	ALL, INCLUDING
THORACIC	CARDIOLOGY	PEDIATRIC
CARDIO-VASCULAR	ENDOCRINOLOGY	CARDIOLOGY
E.N.T.	GASTROENTEROLOGY	
UROLOGY	HEMATOLOGY	
NEUROSURGERY	HEPATOLOGY	
ORTHOPEDICS	INFECTIOUS DISEASE	
PLASTIC	NEPHROLOGY	
	RHEUMATOLOGY	
	PULMONARY	

CAMPUS _____

DATE THE REPORT WAS PREPARED

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MEDICAL SCHOOL FACULTY SALARY SURVEY

DEPARTMENT_____ EFFECTIVE DATE _____

RANK		COMPENSATION		
Rank	Headcount	Base Salary or Guaranteed Component (Average)*	Uniform Compensation Plan Component (Average)*	Grand Total Compensation (Average)*
Professor				
Associate Professor				
Assistant Professor				
Instructor				

*Average salary for each of the three compensation columns should be computed by dividing the total dollars by the headcount for each rank.

Comments or qualifications: _____

APPENDIX B

Brief Descriptions of the Medical Compensation Plans at the Eight Comparison Medical Schools

1) Stanford University

Stanford has a new practice plan that is currently being written and is not yet available.

2) State University of New York - Upstate Medical School

Overall management of the practice plan is vested in a governing board consisting essentially of the President, the Dean of the Medical School and the medical school department chairmen. The departments have considerable autonomy, and keep the accounts and do the billing. The State is paid for overhead costs, and the Medical School levies a surcharge on gross practice plan income for its own use. (A Type "B" or Type "C" Plan)

3) University of Chicago

General guidelines are issued to the departments by the Dean's office. Within those guidelines, individual practice plans are negotiated on a departmental basis. The medical school is experimenting with a surcharge, and with various kinds of non-salary incentives. Currently, however, the individual departments have a good deal of autonomy. (A Type "C" Plan)

4. University of Illinois

No formal practice plan exists. The medical school provides centralized billing facilities. Beyond that, what happens is the result of individual negotiation between the individual faculty member, his department and the Dean's office.

5. University of Michigan

The plan is centralized, with a formal central business office run by a full-time Director who reports directly to the Dean of the Medical School. The central business office establishes policy, does billing and handles

disbursements. The individual departments have comparatively little autonomy. The plan was phased in gradually over the five-year period from 1973 to 1978. (A Type "A" Plan)

6) University of Texas at Houston

The plan is controlled by a Board of Directors consisting of the President, V.P. for Business Affairs and the department chairmen. The plan provides for central billing and disbursement of funds; however, individual faculty salaries are set through individual negotiation between a faculty member and his department chairman. The departments have considerable autonomy. (A Type "B" or Type "C" Plan)

7) University of Wisconsin

Although a written plan exists, its net effect is to vest authority in the individual departments. Each department creates in effect its own individual practice plan and does pretty much as it pleases, subject to certain maximum salary constraints written into the central plan. (A Type "B" or Type "C" Plan)

8) Yale University

The practice plan consists of a series of brief salary guidelines published by the Dean which set up a framework for salary payment and establish the permissible salary ranges within which an individual faculty member may be paid. Each department develops its own practice plan, in negotiation with the Dean's office. Individual salaries are recommended by the department chairman and approved by the Dean. (A Type "C" Plan)

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of March 1987, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Seth P. Brunner, Sacramento
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Roger C. Pettitt, Los Angeles
Sharon N. Skog, Mountain View, *Vice Chairperson*
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Mokelumne Hill

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; representing the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; representing the Trustees of the California State University

Arthur H. Margosian, Fresno; representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Donald A. Henricksen, San Marino; representing California's independent colleges and universities

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; representing the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Angie Papadakis, Palos Verdes; representing the California State Board of Education

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission issues some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1986-87
California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 87-36

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

87-20 Background Papers of the ACR 141 Task Force on Funding Excellence in Higher Education (March 1987)

87-21 Educational Costs in Technical and Professional Fields of Study: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 38 (Chapter 50 of the Statutes of 1986) (April 1987)

87-22 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, University of California and the California State University, Fall 1986 (April 1987)

87-23 Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1985-86: The Eleventh in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and the Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities. (June 1987)

87-24 Looking to California's Pacific Neighborhood: Roles for Higher Education. A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 82 (1986) (June 1987)

87-25 Institutional Reports on Pacific Rim Programs: Submissions by the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 82 (1986) (June 1987) (A supplement to Report 87-24.)

87-26 Major Gains and Losses: Part Two. A Staff Report on Shifts Since 1976 in the Popularity of Various Academic Disciplines as Fields of Study at California's Public Universities (June 1987)

87-27 Faculty Salary Revisions: A Revision of the Commission's 1985 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs (June 1987)

87-28 Comments on the Second Draft of the Master Plan for Postsecondary Education, 1987 - 2002, by William H. Pickens. Executive Director's Report, June 1987 (June 1987)

87-29 Evaluation of the Commission's Office Automation System: A Post-Implementation Evaluation Report to the California State Department of Finance (June 1987)

87-30 California Colleges and Universities. [An alphabetical list of names, addresses, and telephone numbers.] (June 1987)

87-31 California Colleges and Universities Grouped by County (June 1987)

87-32 California Community College Districts and Colleges [An alphabetical list of districts and the colleges they operate, with district addresses, telephone numbers, and names of superintendents.] (June 1987)

87-33 Information Manual: A Guide to the Commission, Its Policies, Procedures, and Members (September 1987)

87-34 Information Manual: A Guide to the Commission, Its Policies, Procedures, Members, and Staff [A revision of Report 87-33 designed exclusively for staff orientation purposes.] (September 1987)

87-35 Appropriations in the 1987-88 State Budget for the Public Segments of Higher Education: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (September 1987)

87-36 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation (September 1987)

87-37 Improving Student Performance Reporting, Review and Epilogue: The Final Report of the Commission's Project on Transforming Student Academic Performance Data into Useful Information (September 1987)

87-38 California College-Going Rates, 1986 Update: The Tenth in a Series of Reports on New Freshmen Enrollment at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (September 1987)